



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/525,999

11/28/2005

Stefan Horeth

10808/193

6219

757 7590 03/17/2008
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

PARIHAR, SUCHIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2825

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/525,999	Applicant(s) HORETH ET AL.	
	Examiner SUCHIN PARIHAR	Art Unit 2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/28/2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/28/05;2/5/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application 10/525,999, preliminary amendment filed on 2/28/2005. Claims 1-7 and 9-17 are currently amended. Claim 8 is cancelled. Claims 1-7 and 9-17 are currently pending in this application.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the method of claims 1 and 14 must be illustrated or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 12 is objected to because it currently depends from a cancelled claim, i.e. claim 8. Correction is required.

4. Claim 15 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim 15 currently depends from claim 14 and claim 1, wherein claim 15 is not indicated as having multiple dependent claim status. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. **Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** because they fail to recite a useful, concrete and tangible result.

7. With respect to claim 16, the claim fails to recite a useful, concrete and tangible **result** that would be provided by the execution of a method using the computer-program product with program-code stored on a data medium.
8. With respect to claim 17, "electronically readable control signals" are not considered statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. **Claims 13 and 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

11. With respect to claim 13, "a method of equivalence class refinement" is not defined in the claim. The recitation "is used for" merely describes the intended use and does not define the meaning of "a method of equivalence class refinement".

12. With respect to claim 15, the specification fails to describe how one of ordinary skill in the art can use the device of claim 14 to execute the method of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

14. **Claims 1, 4-6, 9-12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)** as being anticipated by Jain et al. (US 6,301,687).

15. With respect to claim 1 Jain teaches:

(a) for specific circuit structures (circuit structure, see Abstract) described by the reference description (design specification, Col 1, lines 45-55) of the digital circuit (digital circuit designs, see Abstract), for which different implementation alternatives (different implementations of the same design, Col 1, lines 45-55) are known, in each case that an implementation alternative that has the greatest degree of structural equivalence (checking equivalence by verifying the using different implementations, Col 1, lines 45-55) with the digital circuit to be verified (original specification, Col 1, lines 45-55), is determined, whereby the different implementation alternatives are simulated respectively (pattern simulations used to determine functionally equivalent patterns or nodes, Col 6, lines 25-50) in combination with the reference description and compared (different implementations of the same design are compared to the circuit design, Col 1, lines 45-55) with a corresponding simulation of the digital circuit (extensive simulation to produce the “golden specification”, Col 1, lines 30-55), in order to determine as the implementation alternative with the greatest degree of structural equivalence (checking equivalence by verifying the using different implementations, Col 1, lines 45-55) with the digital circuit, the implementation alternative, which in this case for several simulation patterns has the greatest equivalence of design points (pattern simulations used to

determine functionally equivalent patterns or nodes, Col 6, lines 25-50) with the digital circuit,

(b) in the reference description of the digital circuit, the description of the individual circuit structures is replaced (once the implementation is verified successfully, it becomes the specification for the next implementation comparison, Col 1, lines 45-55) by the implementation alternative determined for the respective circuit structure in step (a) with the greatest degree of structural equivalence in each case, and

(c) the equivalence test is executed by comparing the digital circuit with the reference description changed in accordance with step (b) (the next change in the specification is then compared to determine equivalence with the next implementation, Col 1, lines 45-55).

16. With respect to claims 14-15, Jain teaches:

with first memory (computer memory required for operation, Col 3, lines 25-50) means for storing (simulation results stored, Col 8, lines 60-65) a description of a digital circuit to be verified,

with second memory means (computer memory required for operation, Col 3, lines 25-50) for storing a reference description of the digital circuit (storing gate-level information, Col 8, lines 35-45), and

with verification means, which are set up in such a manner that they-the verification means compare the description of the digital circuit to be verified with the reference description (checking equivalence by verifying the using different

implementations, Col 1, lines 45-55), in order through an equivalence test to recognize errors in the digital circuit, wherein

third memory means (computer memory required for operation, Col 3, lines 25-50) are provided for storing different predefined implementation alternatives (simulation results stored, Col 8, lines 60-65) for specific circuit structures of the digital circuit, whereby the verification means are set up in such a manner that, for the specific circuit structures in each case, the verification means determine an implementation alternative (different implementations of the same design, Col 1, lines 45-55) that has the greatest degree of structural equivalence with the digital circuit to be verified (checking equivalence by verifying the using different implementations, Col 1, lines 45-55),

the verification means are set up in such a manner that, for determining the implementation alternative with the greatest degree of structural equivalence with the digital circuit in each case, the verification means simulate (pattern simulations used to determine functionally equivalent patterns or nodes, Col 6, lines 25-50) the different implementation alternatives respectively in combination with the reference description and compare the simulations with a corresponding simulation of the digital circuit (verifying the first implementation against the original specification through extensive simulation, Col 1, lines 30-60), to determine the implementation alternative with the greatest degree of structural equivalence (see "golden specification, i.e. using the implementation with the highest degree of structural equivalence, Col 1, lines 30-50) with the digital circuit, which for simulation patterns has the greatest equivalence of

design points (pattern simulations used to determine functionally equivalent patterns or nodes, Col 6, lines 25-50) with the digital circuit, and

the verification means are set up in such a manner that the verification means they insert (once the implementation is verified, it becomes [i.e. it is inserted as] the specification for the next implementation equivalence test, Col 1, lines 45-55) the previously determined implementation alternatives with the greatest degree of structural equivalence respectively in the reference description of the digital circuit for the individual specific circuit structures and compare the description of the digital circuit to be verified with the reference description thus changed (the next change in the specification is then compared to determine equivalence with the next implementation, Col 1, lines 45-55) for executing the equivalence test (once the implementation is verified, it becomes [i.e. it is inserted as] the specification for the next implementation equivalence test, Col 1, lines 45-55).

17. With respect to claim 4, Jain teaches:

wherein the process is executed computer-aided (computer-aided design, see Col 1, lines 10-15).

18. With respect to claim 5, Jain teaches:

wherein the reference description is selected from the group comprising RTL, VHDL and verilog descriptions (the original design is represented as an RTL design, Col 1, lines 45-55).

19. With respect to claim 6, Jain teaches:

the equivalence test is executed by comparing the digital circuit with the reference description changed in accordance with step (b) (the next change in the specification is then compared to determine equivalence with the next implementation, Col 1, lines 45-55).

20. With respect to claim 9, Jain teaches:

wherein for each circuit structure, the different implementation alternatives are simulated at the same time and compared with the simulation of the digital circuit (extensive simulation and comparing different implementations of the same design to check for equivalence, i.e. verification, Col 1, lines 45-55).

21. With respect to claim 10, Jain teaches:

wherein the different implementation alternatives for each circuit structure are simulated at the same time by inputs (test vectors that represent all possible inputs to the system, Col 1, lines 1-30) of the implementation alternatives being connected with one another and corresponding outputs (outputs of these test vectors are analyzed, Col 1, lines 1-30) of the implementation alternatives being led to a common output (common output, see Figure 13A) to maintain the circuit function of the individual implementation alternatives.

22. With respect to claim 11, Jain teaches:

wherein the outputs of different implementation alternatives are connected by a logic OR link to the common output (see Figure 13A).

23. With respect to claim 12, Jain teaches:

wherein for each implementation alternative in step (a). the degree of equivalence with the simulation of the digital circuit is obtained by the number of the values output for the individual simulation patterns of the reference description with the respective implementation alternative, the alternative values identically output, which are identical to the values output by the digital circuit for the corresponding simulation patterns, being determined for the several simulation patterns for each implementation alternative and being used as degree of equivalence for the corresponding implementation alternative (outputs are analyzed to try to verify their equivalence, Col 14, lines 40-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. **Claims 2, 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Jain et al. (6,301,687) in view of Higgins et al. (6,993,730).

26. With respect to claim 2, Jain fails to teach:

wherein the specific circuit structures for which the implementation alternative with the greatest degree of equivalence is determined in each case, are multiplier structures.

However, Higgins teaches:

wherein the specific circuit structures for which the implementation alternative with the greatest degree of equivalence is determined in each case, are multiplier structures (equivalencies between two multiplier circuits, Col 12, lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Higgins into the invention of Jain for at least the following reason: Higgins improves the invention of Jain by providing a method that can determine equivalence between two circuit models much quicker than previously attainable in the prior art (see Abstract).

27. With respect to claim 3, Higgins teaches:

wherein the specific circuit structures, for which the implementation alternative with the greatest degree of equivalence is determined in each case, are multiplier structures for realizing integral multiplication function (equivalencies between two multiplier circuits, Col 12, lines 25-35).

28. With respect to claim 7, Jain fails to teach:

wherein the pre-defined implementation alternatives for the specific circuit structures comprise varying architectures of the specific circuit structures aided by a synthesis device available for the design of the digital circuit.

However, Higgins teaches more than one architecture for the specific circuit structures that are multipliers (equivalencies between two multiplier circuits, Col 12, lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Higgins into the invention of Jain for at least the following

reason: Higgins improves the invention of Jain by providing a method that can determine equivalence between two circuit models much quicker than previously attainable in the prior art (see Abstract).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUCHIN PARIHAR whose telephone number is (571)272-6210. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on 571-272-7483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Suchin Parihar
Examiner
AU 2825

Application/Control Number: 10/525,999
Art Unit: 2825

Page 12

/Paul Dinh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2825